

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

PATENT AND TRADEMARK CAUSES

SUITE 300

824 NINTH STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001-5303

TELEPHONE (202)-628-5197

SHERIDAN NEIMARK
ROGER L. BROWDYANNE M. KORNBAU
NORMAN J. LATKER
RONNI S. JILLIONS
DIANA MICHELLE SOBO
AOI NAWASHIROOF COUNSEL
IVER P. COOPER
JAY M. FINKELSTEIN

ALVIN BROWDY (1917-1998)

PATENT AGENT

ALLEN C. YUN, Ph.D.

TELECOPIER FACSIMILE
(202) 737-3528
(202) 393-1012E-MAIL
mail@browdyneimark.comTELEFAX CONTROL SHEET

SENT TO: USPTO Central Fax

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 20 2004

DATE SENT: August 20, 2004

SUBJECT: Resubmission of Paper

No. of pages (including this cover sheet): 9

FROM: Roger L. Browdy

Remarks:

This is a retransmission of a paper entitled Application for Patent Term Adjustment under 37 C.F.R. §1.705(b) in application no. 10/009,300. The original paper was received by the PTO fax server on 8/20/2004 at 2:42:05 PM (EDT).

The original paper inadvertently omitted authorization to charge the fee. Please disregard the original transmission.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

This confidential facsimile message is intended only for the individual entity named above, and may contain information that is privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you, the reader of this message, are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you should not copy this facsimile or distribute it to anyone other than the intended recipient. In addition, if you have received this telecopy in error, please immediately notify us by telephone or telefax and return the original message to us at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Finally, if it would not inconvenience you, we would appreciate it if you would first refax this message to the intended recipient. Thank you.

If this transmission is not well received, please advise us at our telecopier no. 202-737-3528 or by e-mail at mail@browdyneimark.com, or call our voice telephone no. 202-628-5197.

*14 complete
missing 3 pages*

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Atty. Docket: WARSHAWSKY=3

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| In re Application of: |) | Conf. No.: 5740 |
| |) | |
| Abraham WARSHAWSKY et al |) | Attn: Office of the |
| |) | Deputy Commissioner for |
| Appln. No.: 10/009,300 |) | Patent Examination Policy |
| |) | |
| Filed: May 13, 2002 |) | Washington, D.C. |
| |) | |
| For: PHARMACEUTICAL |) | August 20, 2004 |
| COMPOSITIONS COMPRISING |) | |
| IRON CHELATORS FOR THE ...) |) | VIA TELEFACSIMILE |

APPLICATION FOR PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.705(b)

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
2011 South Clark Place
Customer Window, Mail Stop Petitions
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03
Arlington, VA 22202

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.705(b), the present application for patent term adjustment is intended as a request for reconsideration of the patent term adjustment indicated in the Notice of Allowance. The present application is being filed no later than the payment of the issue fee.

37 C.F.R. §1.705(b) (1)

Please charge the fee of \$200, as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.18(e), to deposit account no. 02-4035 of the undersigned. If the fee submitted is deficient or is in excess of that required, please charge any deficiency or credit any excess to the same deposit account.

In re of Appln. No. 10/009,300

37 C.F.R. §1.705(b)(2)(i)

Applicant contends that the correct patent term in this case should be 317 days, and that the basis is 37 C.F.R. §1.702(a)(1).

37 C.F.R. §1.705(b)(2)(ii)

The relevant dates as specified in 37 C.F.R. §1.703(a) through (e) for which an adjustment is sought, and the adjustment, as specified in §1.703(f), to which the patent is entitled, are as follows:

The present application fulfilled the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §371 on May 13, 2002. The date that is 14 months thereafter is July 13, 2003. While an official action was mailed December 17, 2003, this official action was issued in error and was subsequently withdrawn. Thus, it cannot be counted as the date of mailing of an action under 35 U.S.C. §132. The first action after withdrawal of the official action of December 17, 2003, was the Notice of Allowance issued on May 25, 2004. The total number of days from July 13, 2003, through May 25, 2004, is 317 days.

The determination of patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. §154(b), mailed with the Notice of Allowance on May 25, 2004, states that the patent term adjustment to date is 157 days. There are 157 days between the date that is 14 months after completion of the 35 U.S.C. §371 requirement, i.e., July 13, 2003, and the date of the first (and subsequently

In re of Appln. No. 10/009,300

withdrawn) official action, which was December 17, 2003. Thus, this time period was obviously calculated based on the date of the official action of December 17, 2003. This was erroneous, however, because this official action was mailed in error and was eventually withdrawn. Accordingly, it should not be considered to be an action under 35 U.S.C. §132, insofar as 37 C.F.R. §1.702(a)(1) is concerned.

The present national stage application under 35 U.S.C. §371 was deposited in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on December 7, 2001. Responsive to a notice of missing requirements issued on March 11, 2002, applicants filed a late submission of declaration, as well as a second preliminary amendment (the first preliminary amendment having been filed with the original filing of the case). The late submission was filed on May 13, 2002. A Notice of Acceptance was subsequently received, setting the date of May 13, 2002, as the date of receipt of all 35 U.S.C. §371(c)(1), (2) and (4) requirements.

On March 25, 2003, a third preliminary amendment was filed, making substantial amendments to the claims, and adding new claims 25-33.

Despite the fact that the official action of December 17, 2003, was issued almost nine months after the date of filing of the third preliminary amendment of March 25, 2003. The official action of December 17, 2003, did not

In re of Appln. No. 10/009,300

consider the changes made by the third preliminary amendment, or the new claims added therein. Soon after the official action of December 17, 2003, was received, the undersigned tried to contact Examiner John M. Ford, who signed this official action, to ask that it be withdrawn and a new official action issued taking into account the third preliminary amendment. The examiner did not return repeated telephone calls. The undersigned periodically tried to reach the examiner for months, leaving messages on his voicemail. When the examiner never responded, the undersigned started to call his supervisor, Mr. Mukund Shah, and still received no response.

Finally, by May the frustration of the undersigned caused him to start calling examiners and staff personnel in the Group 1600 directory at random to try to find anyone who could help. Navigating the Customer Service Help Line is impossible when dealing with a specific question such as this. Director Chamber's office was called, but no quick response to the voicemail was received. It seems that she was out of the office that week. The undersigned eventually learned from another examiner that Examiner Ford had left the Office some time ago, and apparently nobody had bothered to turn off his voicemail. Furthermore, his supervisor, Mr. Shah, had been out for some time with medical problems, but this information also did not make his voicemail message. It was learned that

In re of Appln. No. 10/009,300

Mr. James Wilson was acting SPE. A voicemail was left with him. Eventually, the undersigned contacted Ms. Rosa Thomas, who was very helpful and advised that Examiner Richard Raymond was now assigned to this case. Mr. Wilson returned the call of the undersigned soon after, and Mr. Raymond was eventually reached. At the time, the undersigned pointed out, with some distress, that no one had ever returned our phone calls over the previous several months, and that a new official action taking into account the preliminary amendment of March 25, 2003, was needed.

Finally, on May 17, 2004, Examiner Raymond agreed that the official action of December 17, 2003, failed to acknowledge and be responsive to the third preliminary amendment of May 25, 2003, and that since this amendment extensively amended the pending claims and added nine new claims, a supplemental or new action would be prepared. The examiner interview summary record with respect to this interview is of record in this case. On May 20, 2004, another telephone interview was conducted, initiated by Examiner Raymond, informing the undersigned that the claims of the application had been found to be allowable, and that a Notice of Allowance would be issued.

On May 25, 2004, a Notice of Allowance was issued in light of the amendment of March 25, 2003. While no reference to the previous official action was made in the Notice of

In re of Appln. No. 10/009,300

Allowance, it is clear that it was withdrawn, as applicant never formally responded thereto, and the case was not deemed to be abandoned. The examiner interview statement of May 17, 2004, acknowledges that the official action of December 17, 2003, was issued in error. The issuance of the Notice of Allowance clearly had the effect of withdrawing that official action. As the official action was withdrawn, it is as if it had never issued. Therefore, it cannot serve to toll the time that it took for the Patent and Trademark Office to mail either a notification under 35 U.S.C. §132 or a Notice of Allowance under 35 U.S.C. §151.

There are no relevant dates under 37 C.F.R. §§1.703(a)(2) through (6). The number of days for each of those is zero.

As applicant does not claim any adjustment under 37 C.F.R. §§1.702(b) through (e), there are no relevant dates in 37 C.F.R. §§1.703(b) through (e), for which an adjustment is sought, nor is there any adjustment sought under 37 C.F.R. §1.703(f).

--